

Applicant : William L. Tonar et al.
Appln. No. : 10/777,846
Page : 2

REMARKS

In the Office Action of July 14, 2004, the Examiner has indicated, and the Applicant acknowledges, that claims 1-36 remain pending.

The Applicant would like to thank the Examiner for her courtesy extended to Applicant's representative Mr. James Shultz during a telephone interview conducted on November 2, 2004. The substance of the interview is included herein.

Turning to paragraph three of the Office Action, the Examiner has rejected claims 1-18 under 35 U.S.C. §102(b) as being anticipated by Larson et al. (U.S. Patent 5,285,060). The Applicants respectfully traverse this rejection for the following reasons.

The Applicant respectfully submits that Larson et al. does not teach or suggest a vehicle information display assembly, comprising: a light source positioned behind a transreflective reflector with respect to a viewer; and a controller configured to generate a light source control signal as a function of light rays originating from said light source and light rays reflected by said reflector as recited in claim 1 of the present application. In that claims 2-4 depend from claim 1, the Applicants submit that claims 1-4 are in condition for allowance over Larson et al.

The Applicants respectfully submit that Larson et al. does not teach or suggest a vehicle information display assembly, comprising: a light source positioned behind a

Applicant : William L. Tonar et al.
Appln. No. : 10/777,846
Page : 3

transflective reflector with respect to a viewer; and a controller configured to receive a light level signal, said controller is further configured to generate a light source control signal as a function of light rays originating from said light source and light rays reflected by said reflector when said light level signal is above a threshold as recited in claim 5 of the present application. In that claims 6-8 depend from claim 5, the Applicants submit that claims 5-8 are in condition for allowance over Larson et al.

The Applicants respectfully submit that Larson et al. does not teach or suggest a vehicle information display assembly, comprising: a light source positioned behind a transflective reflector with respect to a viewer; and a controller configured to control a ratio of light rays originating from said light source with respect to light rays reflected by said reflector as recited in claim 9 of the present application. In that claims 10-12 depend from claim 9, the Applicants submit that claims 9-12 are in condition for allowance over Larson et al.

The Applicants respectfully submit that Larson et al. does not teach or suggest a vehicle information display assembly, comprising: a light source positioned behind a variable reflectance transflective reflective element with respect to a viewer; and a controller configured to control a ratio of light rays originating from said light source with respect to light rays reflected by said reflector by controlling either: a light source brightness, a reflective element reflectance, or both a light source brightness and a reflective element reflectance as recited in claim 13 of the present application. In that

Applicant : William L. Tonar et al.
Appln. No. : 10/777,846
Page : 4

claims 14-16 depend from claim 13, the Applicants submit that claims 13-16 are in condition for allowance over Larson et al.

The Applicants respectfully submit that Larson et al. does not teach or suggest a vehicle information display assembly, comprising: a light source positioned behind a variable reflectance transflective element; and a controller configured to receive a light level signal, said controller is further configured to determine when said light level signal is above a threshold and to generate a light source control signal as a function of either; a light source brightness, a reflective element reflectance, or both a light source brightness and a reflective element reflectance; when said light level signal is above said threshold as recited in claim 17 of the present application. In that claim 18 depends from claim 17, the Applicants submit that claims 17 and 18 are in condition for allowance over Larson et al.

Turning to paragraph four of the Office Action, the Examiner has rejected claims 23-25 and 29 under 35 U.S.C. §102(b) as being unpatentable by Baumann et al. (U.S. Patent 6,020,987). The Applicants respectfully traverse this rejection for the following reasons. The Applicants submit that since claims 23-25 and 29 depend from claim 17 and in light of the above discussion regarding the patentability of claim 17 that claims 23-25 and 29 are in condition for allowance over Baumann et al.

Turning to paragraph five of the Office Action, the Examiner has rejected claim 28 under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as being unpatentable over Baumann et al. (U.S. Patent 6,020,987) in view of Larson et al. (U.S. Patent 5,285,060). The Applicant respectfully

Applicant : William L. Tonar et al.
Appn. No. : 10/777,846
Page : 5

traverses this rejection for the following reasons. The Applicants submit that since claim 28 depends from claim 17, and in light of the above discussion regarding the patentability of claim 17, that claim 28 is in condition form allowance over Baumann et al and Larson et al.

Turning to paragraph six of the Office Action, the Applicants acknowledge and thank the Examiner for the early indication of allowance of claims 30-36 of the present application.

Turning to paragraph seven of the Office Action, the Examiner has objected to claims 19-22, 26 and 27 as being dependent upon a rejected base claim, but would be allowable if rewritten in independent form including all of the limitations of the base claim and any intervening claims. The Applicants submit that since claims 19-22, 26 and 27 depend from claim 17, and in light of the above discussion regarding the patentability of claim 17, that claims 19-22, 26 and 27 are in condition form allowance

Applicants therefore respectfully submit that claims 1-36 are in condition for allowance. The Applicants respectfully request that the Examiner reconsider this case and requests removal of the rejections. The Applicants, therefore, respectfully request that a timely Notice of Allowance be issued in this case. Please contact the undersigned should additional information be required.

Applicant : William L. Tonar et al.
Appn. No. : 10/777,846
Page : 6

Respectfully submitted,
WILLIAM L. TONAR ET AL.
By: Gentex Corporation

November 3, 2004
Date

J. Shultz Jr.
James E. Shultz Jr.
Registration No. 50,511
600 N. Centennial Street
Zeeland, Michigan 49464
(616) 772-1800

Page 6 of 6